



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

CLIMATE CHANGE RESILIENT DEVELOPMENT

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN (PMP)
REVISED DRAFT FINAL

April 13, 2012

This report was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). It was prepared by International Resources Group (IRG).

CLIMATE CHANGE RESILIENT DEVELOPMENT

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN (PMP)
REVISED DRAFT FINAL

April 13, 2012

DISCLAIMER

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	OBJECTIVES OF CCRD PMP	1
3.	PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK	2
4.	PMP UPDATING	5
5.	APPROACH TO MONITORING AND EVALUATION	5

ACRONYMS AND SPECIAL TERMS

AREFS	Asia Regional Environmental Field Support Project
CCRD	Climate Change Resilient Development Task Order
COR	Contracting Officer's Representative
GCC	Global Climate Change
IR	Intermediate result
IRI	International Research Institute for Climate and Society
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
NGO	Non-governmental organization
PMP	Performance Management Plan
PPL	Policy, Planning and Learning Bureau (USAID)
SO	Strategic objective
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	US Government

I. INTRODUCTION

The Performance Management Plan (PMP) is a critical tool for planning, managing, and documenting progress towards achieving the strategic objective of the project: to enhance resilience of developing country populations, assets, and livelihoods through improved capacity to respond to climate change impacts. The PMP is essential to the Climate Change Resilient Development (CCRD) Task Order's performance-based management approach, as the data collected and reported for each indicator will provide the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) and USAID/ Global Climate Change (GCC) Office with detailed information on project progress and outcomes, reflected in performance indicators. It also contributes to the effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system by assuring that comparable and quality performance data are collected over time. Further, the PMP provides the data and analyses required to inform management decisions, improve operations, identify performance gaps, reassess performance targets, and set goals for improvement.

The remainder of the PMP is organized into four sections: Section 2 enumerates the objectives of the PMP; Section 3 provides a description of the performance management framework and includes the results framework and describes the relations between indicators, activities, and tasks; Section 4 describes the proposed process for updating the PMP; and Section 5 presents our overall approach to monitoring and evaluation and provides detail on the initial set of performance indicators proposed for the CCRD Task Order.

2. OBJECTIVES OF CCRD PMP

The CCRD PMP is designed to achieve three distinct objectives:

- ***Support CCRD progress reporting*** – Our PMP includes milestone indicators to track progress in completing interim and final deliverables in the Technical Approach (see the Year One Work Plan timeline, Annex I) and performance indicators to track outputs and outcomes in the Year One Work Plan. These will be used to report CCRD Task Order progress to the COR and GCC Office in quarterly progress reports as well as semi-annual and annual performance monitoring reports.
- ***Monitor project performance*** – In addition to selecting indicators, we will develop a protocol for collecting indicator data; conducting analysis where the indicator is not directly observable; proposing a means of verification for each indicator; determining appropriate disaggregation of indicators and targets by gender, audience, sector, geographic region, or other appropriate factors; and setting annual targets for each indicator.
- ***Support adaptive management*** – We will use the PMP not only for monitoring progress but also for evaluating overall management of the CCRD Task Order and making adjustments as needed to strengthen the efficacy of project delivery. PMP findings will inform fine-tuning of tasks and subtasks on a continuous basis and, with COR concurrence, adjusting the PMP itself.

3. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

USAID recently issued the Climate Change & Development – Clean Resilient Growth Strategy, 2012-2016. The goal of the Strategy is to:

“Enable countries to accelerate their transition to climate-resilient low emission sustainable economic development.”

The Strategy covers the three pillars: clean energy, sustainable landscapes, and adaptation and is organized into three Strategic Objectives (SOs) and corresponding intermediate results. The three SOs are:

- SO 1. Accelerate the transition to low emission development through investments in clean energy and sustainable landscapes**
- SO 2. Increase resilience of people, places, and livelihoods through investments in adaptation**
- SO 3. Strengthen development outcomes by integrating climate change in Agency programming, learning, policy dialogues and operations**

As CCRD stresses mainstreaming of adaptation in economic development and sector plans, there is scope for low emission development (SO 1) although CCRD will not be directly supporting investments in clean energy or sustainable landscapes unless they directly relate to the implementation of adaptations. The main focus of CCRD will be to promote SO2 and SO3.

CCRD is organized into three project objectives, as described in the Year One Work Plan (see Exhibit 1, p. 3 in the CCRD Year One Work Plan) and 10 activities. Exhibit 1 below provides an overview of the CCRD objectives and activities and their link to the Strategy’s SOs and Intermediate Results.

Exhibit 1. CCRD Objectives and Activities

CCRD Objectives and Activities	USAID Climate Change & Development Strategy	
	Strategic Objectives (SO)	Intermediate Results (IR)
Objective 1: Provide support to USAID Missions and Bureaus to mainstream climate into development programs and projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity 1.1: Guidance • Activity 1.2: Information, Tools, and Science and Policy • Activity 1.3 Technical Assistance and Capacity Building Support • Activity 1.4: Other Activities 	SO 2, SO 3	IR 2.1, IR 2.2, IR 2.3, IR 3.1, IR 3.2
Objective 2: Coordinate with other US Government (USG) Agencies to support global mainstreaming of adaptation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity 2.1: Adaptation Partnership Workshops • Activity 2.2: Adaptation Communities of Practice • Activity 2.3: Other Activities 	SO 2	IR 2.1, IR 2.2, IR 3.2

<p>Objective 3: Identify and respond to emerging issues and provide KM assistance for design, planning, and implementation of climate resilient development planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity 3.1: Resilient Program Design • Activity 3.2: Glaciers and Mountains • Activity 3.3: Climate Services • Activity 3.4: Other Activities 	SO 2, SO 3	IR 2.1, IR 2.3, IR 3.1, IR 3.2
---	------------	--------------------------------

Notes: IR 2.1 Improve access to science and analysis for decision making
IR 2.2 Establish effective governance systems
IR 2.3 Identify and take actions that increase climate resilience
IR 3.1 Integrate climate change across USAID's development portfolio
IR 3.2 Elevate the role of development in climate change dialogues and policies

3.1 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Performance indicators are an indispensable management tool for making performance-based decisions by defining the data to be collected to measure progress, and enabling actual results achieved over time to be compared with planned results. CCRD performance indicators are based on the project's strategic objective and intermediate results areas, and linked directly to the activities, tasks, and subtasks described in the Year One Work Plan. To track progress of project activities for timely correction and improvements, as well as progress towards achievement of the strategic objective and results areas, the PMP will employ six standard indicators and five custom indicators. Included among the standard indicators is Indicator #1, which is the only indicator that is mandatory for all adaptation funding. The standard indicators afford USAID the opportunity to aggregate progress across USAID Mission and Bureau projects which receive adaptation funding. Exhibit 2 provides a list of standard and custom indicators and the corresponding activities that will be monitored and assessed by CCRD in support of performance targets for each indicator. Exhibits 3 and 4 (at the end of the PMP) provide additional detail on performance indicators and the corresponding annual targets that will be used to track and measure progress in achieving CCRD's strategic objective.

The indicators listed in Exhibit 2 are mostly "output" indicators and are more useful for tracking progress than for understanding the results of project technical assistance and capacity building efforts. In addition, they represent only a first step in adaptive management of CCRD; they can help CCRD track the pace of activities but not the quality of the assistance provided. For these reasons, CCRD plans to structure its performance monitoring to "get behind the numbers" to determine if our assistance is effective, how it might be improved, and understand if and how recipients can capitalize on assistance to increase their resilience to climate change.

The indicators were designed to measure progress in areas of specific need. There are overarching motivations for these indicators into which we have grouped the indicators as shown below.

- Low capacity to assess and take action to address climate vulnerabilities (Indicators 1, 2, 5, 6, and 9)
- Need for technical support to address climate vulnerabilities (Indicators 7, 8, 10)
- Difficulty in accessing finance for climate adaptation (Indicators 4 and 11)
- Need for planning and governance assistance to cope with climate change (Indicator 3)

In a subsequent memo, CCRD will provide additional detail on the global baseline context for each of these areas. It is against these baseline conditions that the ultimate outcomes and impact of CCRD may be evaluated over the long term. Even though CCRD is designed as a four-year project, its contributions to increased resilience are expected to be observed over the coming decades as climate continues to change. Thus, measurement and evaluation of its results would require long-term monitoring. As CCRD work shifts to partners and their countries, we will discuss options for integrating longer term M&E into technical assistance designs.

3.2 BASELINE AND TARGET VALUES

With the exception of Indicator #10 (one of the websites – the Adaptation Partnership website – predates the CCRD project), the relevant baseline for all indicators is the start of the project and a numerical value of zero. None of the proposed indicators represents a percentage increase in a value similar to indicators used for biodiversity programs (e.g., percentage of forests under improved management). It is important to understand baseline conditions, both to determine the types of assistance that is demanded and to understand how the assistance may impact on people and institutions. However, CCRD will invest resources to better understand baseline conditions only when there are perceived benefits to be derived from the baseline analysis in terms of improving the design or assistance programs and measuring effectiveness and success.

Because of the flexible, demand-driven nature of CCRD activities, it is difficult to set targets for most indicators in Year One because CCRD has not planned many field-based activities and has been requested to provide support to only two USAID Missions. For a few indicators such as #10, once the CCRD/ Asia Regional Environmental Field Support Project (AREFS) website has operated for a few months, it will be possible to set a target for Year Two. Thus, in Exhibits 3 and 4, all indicator targets are TBD for Year One, Year Two, and the two option years.

Establishing a comprehensive baseline that would serve as a foundation for measuring each of the outcomes articulated in Exhibit 2 would be cost prohibitive; therefore, the CCRD team will attempt to leverage and stay abreast of related research efforts to characterize the baseline capacity of various target audiences with respect to climate adaptation. Some examples of studies like this include the needs assessment being undertaken in the learning survey done by the Policy, Planning and Learning (PPL) Bureau and the needs assessment being undertaken by the Asia Bureau through the Asia Regional Environmental Field Support Project. As appropriate, CCRD will strive to characterize baselines for specific activities, tasks, and sub-tasks. Some examples related to work currently underway include the M&E survey for the Adaptation Partnership workshop in Bonn, Germany and the Task Needs assessment – typology of decisions and info needs under Activity 1.2.

Exhibit 2. CCRD Performance Indicators

Indicator #	Standard Climate Change Indicator (Program Element 4.8: Environment)	Year One Activities
1	Number of people with increased capacity to adapt to the impacts of climate variability and change as a result of USG assistance (mandatory for Adaptation funding)	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3
2	Number of people receiving training in climate change supported by USG assistance (Person hours of training completed in climate change supported by USG assistance)	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3
3	Number of laws, policies, strategies, plans, agreements, or regulations addressing climate change officially proposed, adopted, or implemented as a result of USG assistance	1.1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3
4	Amount of investment leveraged in U.S. dollars from private and public sources, for climate change as a result of USG assistance	2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3
5	Number of institutions with improved capacity to address climate change issues as a result of USG assistance	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3
6	Number of days of USG-funded technical assistance in climate change provided to counterparts or stakeholders	1.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3
Indicator #	Custom Indicator	Year One Activities
7	Number of climate adaptation tools, technologies, and methodologies developed, tested, and/or adopted as a result of USG assistance	1.1, 1.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3
8	Number of climate vulnerability assessments conducted	1.1, 1.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3
9	Number of people registering to participate in adaptation-related communities of practice	2.1, 2.2, 3.2, 3.3
10	Number of people logging on to/accessing the adaptation-related websites supported with USG assistance	1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3
11	Number of adaptation financing proposals benefitting from USG assistance	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3

4. PMP UPDATING

CCRD plans to update the PMP to reflect significant changes to the Work Plan as new activities and tasks are added to the Year One Work Plan and/or when it is possible to quantify indicator targets. The PMP will also be updated during the development of the work plan for Year Two and the two option years.

5. APPROACH TO MONITORING AND EVALUATION

As discussed earlier, the preparation of the draft final PMP involved development of a draft Results Framework, designed to link tasks to expected outcomes. This process worked in two ways: working backward from expected outcomes through tasks to determine if successful completion of tasks would achieve the expected outcomes, and also working forward from tasks to determine whether the expected

outcomes were feasible if tasks were completed successfully. The results framework has been updated to better advance the intermediate results in USAID Climate Change Strategy.

The proposed indicators include output and outcome indicators. While impact indicators are highly desirable, impact is difficult to measure using indicators and often lags beyond the life of the project. We will identify further impact indicators and/or qualitative evaluation options that could be employed to evaluate impacts of task order activities.

In selecting the suite of indicators proposed for CCRD, we reviewed the list of standard (Foreign Assistance Framework or “F”) indicators, selected six of the standard indicators, and developed five additional “custom” indicators to enable CCRD to track project performance. Exhibits 3 and 4 provide detail information for each indicator, including: indicator definition, indicator type (output, outcome), unit of measure, type of disaggregation, means of verification, and yearly targets.

Exhibit 3. Standard Indicators and Targets

<p>Indicator 1: Number of people with increased capacity to adapt to the impacts of climate variability and change as a result of USG assistance</p> <p>Definition: Adaptive capacity is the ability to adjust to climate change, to moderate potential damages, to take advantage of opportunities, or to cope with the consequences. An increase in adaptive capacity can be shown with the use of surveys or assessments of capacities. Having the “ability to adjust” to climate change impacts will measure an objective of the project to deal with climate stresses (in the context of other stresses).</p> <p>People with improved adaptive capacity may be: 1) implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change, for example: i) implementing water-saving strategies to deal with increasing water stress; ii) making index-based micro-insurance available to assist farmers in dealing with increasing weather variability; iii) adjusting farming practices like soil management, crop choice, or seeds, to better cope with climate stress; or iv) implementing education campaigns to promote the use of risk reducing practices, like use of storm shelters and bed nets that help people cope with climate stress; or 2) using climate information in decision making, for example: i) utilizing short-term weather forecasts to inform decision-making, for example, by farmer cooperatives, disaster or water managers; ii) utilizing climate projections or scenarios to inform planning over medium to longer term timescales, for example, for infrastructure or land use planning; or iii) conducting climate vulnerability assessment to inform infrastructure design or planning as “due diligence”</p> <p>Indicator Type: Outcome</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Individual (note: per discussions with USAID, “people” as opposed to “stakeholders” is used as the unit of measure)</p> <p>Disaggregated by: Gender; individuals implementing risk-reducing practices/actions vs. using climate information in decision-making; audience (e.g., decision-makers, planners, community members, and other implementing partners); and mechanism of increased adaptive capacity (awareness, training, field testing, adoption of technologies and/or practices)</p> <p>Means of Verification: Copies of signed participants lists, project team analysis of participation in assessment, training, and piloting activities</p> <p>Baseline: Start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero.</p> <p>Targets: Year 1: TBD; Year 2: TBD; Option Years: TBD</p>
<p>Indicator 2: Number of people receiving training in climate change supported by USG assistance</p> <p>Definition: The number of people trained in global climate change, including the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC); national programs or policies to adapt to global climate change; promotion of public awareness efforts; and activities to reduce the vulnerability to climate change impacts</p> <p>Indicator Type: Output</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Number of people</p> <p>Disaggregated by: Gender</p> <p>Means of Verification: Copies of signed participant lists, training materials, training agendas</p> <p>Baseline: Start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero.</p> <p>Targets: Year 1: TBD; Year 2: TBD; Option Years: TBD</p>

<p>Indicator 3: Number of laws, policies, strategies, plans, agreements, or regulations addressing climate change officially proposed, adopted, or implemented as a result of USG assistance</p> <p>Definition: Policies, laws, strategies, plans, agreements and regulations include those developed and formally endorsed by governmental, non-governmental, civil society, and/or private sector stakeholders to address climate change and/or biodiversity conservation issues. A measure must at least be formally proposed within an official government process to be reported.</p> <p>Indicator Type: Output</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Number of laws, policies, strategies, plans, agreements or regulations</p> <p>Disaggregated by: Region, country, level of government</p> <p>Means of Verification: Copies of draft policies, official adopted versions, correspondence with partner, other documentation of implementation.</p> <p>Baseline: Start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero.</p> <p>Targets: Year 1: TBD; Year 2: TBD; Option Years: TBD</p>
<p>Indicator 4: Amount of investment leveraged in U.S. dollars from private and public sources as a result of USG assistance</p> <p>Definition: Funding leveraged, as a result of USAID assistance, for climate change programs that support actions, activities, projects or programs that increase capacity to adapt to the impacts of climate variability and change. Funding may be leveraged from the public sector (e.g., other donors) or private sector financing (e.g., corporate investments) and must be additional to USG funds invested in a program.</p> <p>Indicator Type: Output</p> <p>Unit of Measure: U.S. dollars</p> <p>Disaggregated by: Public and private sources of leveraged investment</p> <p>Means of Verification: Copies of documents provided by sources of leveraged investment</p> <p>Baseline: Start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero.</p> <p>Targets: None – leveraged investment is desirable but project not focused on meeting preset amount</p>
<p>Indicator 5: Number of institutions with improved capacity to address climate change issues as a result of USG assistance</p> <p>Definition: Institutions with improved capacity will be better able to govern, coordinate, analyze, advise, or make decisions related to adaptation. “Improvement” can be ascertained using an assessment of capabilities compared with a baseline assessment. For assessing capabilities, some proxies of institutional capacity to engage with climate change adaptation, clean energy, or sustainable landscapes (including REDD+) could include, but would not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing input to relevant assessment or planning exercises, • Having certified or technically trained staff, • Engaging with stakeholders to ensure that policies, plans, budgets and investments reflect local realities and ensure that local communities benefit from climate change efforts and investments, • Having access to equipment or other inputs necessary for planning, assessment and management of climate change topics, or • Collaborating with scientists and policymakers, or hosting workshops involving relevant sectors or themes (e.g., agriculture, environment, forestry, energy, and water) to engage with climate change assessments, plans, or activities. <p>Indicator Type: Output</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Number of institutions</p> <p>Disaggregated by: Sector, geographic region</p> <p>Means of Verification: Copies of signed participant lists, project team analysis of participation in assessment, training, and piloting activities</p> <p>Baseline: Start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero.</p> <p>Targets: Year 1: TBD; Year 2: TBD; Option Years: TBD</p>
<p>Indicator 6: Number of days of USG funded technical assistance in climate change provided to counterparts or stakeholders</p> <p>Definition: The provision of goods or services to developing countries and other USAID recipients in direct support of a development objective. Services could include the transfer of knowledge and/or expertise by way of staff, skills training, research work and financing to support quality of program implementation and impact, support administration, management, representation, publicity, policy development and capacity building.</p> <p>Indicator Type: Output</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Number of days of technical assistance provide, rounded up to full day</p> <p>Disaggregated by: Sector, geographic region</p> <p>Means of Verification: Copies of signed participant lists, project team analysis of participation in assessment, training, and piloting activities</p> <p>Baseline: Baseline is the start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero to measure the incremental change in the number of days of technical assistance provided by the project.</p> <p>Targets: Year 1: TBD; Year 2: TBD; Option Years: TBD</p>

Exhibit 4. Custom Indicators and Targets

Indicator 7: Number of climate adaptation tools, technologies and methodologies developed, tested, and/or adopted as a result of USG assistance
<p>Definition: Number of climate adaptation tools, technologies and methodologies developed or tested</p> <p>Indicator Type: Output</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Number of tools, technologies, and methodologies</p> <p>Disaggregated by: Type (i.e., tool, technology, or methodology)</p> <p>Means of Verification: Documentation on tools, technologies and management approaches, project team analysis</p> <p>Baseline: Start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero.</p> <p>Targets: Year 1: TBD; Year 2: TBD; Option Years: TBD</p>
Indicator 8: Number of climate vulnerability assessments conducted
<p>Definition: Number of climate vulnerability assessments carried out as a result of USG assistance</p> <p>Indicator Type: Output</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Number of assessments</p> <p>Disaggregated by: Scale (e.g., national, subnational, community, ecosystem, sectoral), geographic region</p> <p>Means of Verification: Copies of vulnerability assessments conducted</p> <p>Baseline: Start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero.</p> <p>Targets: Year 1: TBD; Year 2: TBD; Option Years: TBD</p>
Indicator 9: Number of people registering to participate in adaptation-related communities of practice
<p>Definition: Number of people registering to participate in one of the Adaptation Partnership-supported and adaptation-related communities of practice</p> <p>Indicator Type: Output</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Number of people</p> <p>Disaggregated by: Gender; community of practice (e.g., High Mountain Glacial Watershed Program, Climate Services Partnership); type of organization (donor, university or research institute, NGO, private sector)</p> <p>Means of Verification: Reports generated by Google Analytics or similar website reporting tool</p> <p>Baseline: Start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero.</p> <p>Targets: Year 1: TBD; Year 2: TBD; Option Years: TBD</p>
Indicator 10: Number of people logging on to/accessing the adaptation-related websites supported with USG assistance
<p>Definition: Number of “hits” registered on the CCRD/AREFS and Adaptation Partnership websites</p> <p>Indicator Type: Output</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Number of hits</p> <p>Disaggregated by: Website; type of content viewed; documents downloaded</p> <p>Means of Verification: Reports generated by Google Analytics or similar website reporting tool</p> <p>Baseline: Start year of the project. The baseline value will be zero.</p> <p>Targets: Year 1: TBD; Year 2: TBD; Option Years: TBD</p>
Indicator 11: Number of adaptation financing proposals benefitting from USG assistance
<p>Definition: Number of developing country applications for non-USG adaptation financing receiving USG-supported technical assistance related to climate risk/vulnerability assessments and/or design of adaptations</p> <p>Indicator Type: Output</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Number of applications; value of applications</p> <p>Disaggregated by: Region, country, government, NGO</p> <p>Means of Verification: Copies of MOUs, SOWs covering technical assistance</p> <p>Targets: Year 1: TBD; Year 2: TBD; Option Years: TBD</p>

U.S. Agency for International Development

1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20523

Tel: (202) 712-0000

Fax: (202) 216-3524

www.usaid.gov